

[Type here]



Historic Town of Hyde Park

Planning Board
4383 Albany Post Road
Hyde Park, NY 12538
(845) 229-5111, Ext. 2, (845) 229-0349 Fax

“Working with you for a better Hyde Park”

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE **July 19, 2017**

PUBLIC HEARING/REGULAR MEETING OF THE HYDE PARK PLANNING BOARD

MEMBERS PRESENT: MICHAEL DUPREE, CHAIRMAN
ANNE DEXTER - VICE CHAIR
CHAN MURPHEY-VICE CHAIR
BRENT PICKETT
DIANE DI NAPOLI
CHRISTOPHER OLIVER

MEMBER ABSENT: VICTORIA KANE

OTHERS PRESENT: VICTORIA POLIDORO, PB ATTORNEY
PETE SETARO, PB ENGINEERING CONSULTANT
CYNTHIA WITMAN, PLANNING BOARD SECRETARY

TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE #
ENCLAVE AT HYDE PARK	2-9
RIGHT HOMES RE-SUBDIVISION	10-
DOSIO-4 HIGH STREET	-
CIRE OF DUTCHESS	-
BELLEFIELD/ ST. ANDREWS PEOPERTY	-
HINZ-SHAFFER	-
CRAIG THOMAS-ORKIN	-
RODEWALD-CONSOLINI	-
APPROVAL OF PB MINUTES JUNE 7 & 21, 2017	

[Type here]

Chairman Dupree: Good evening ladies and gentlemen and welcome to the July 19th meeting of the Hyde Park Planning Board. Please take note of all the exits around the room in case of emergency and now join me as we reaffirm our loyalty to the great American Flag. *Chairman Dupree commenced the Pledge of Allegiance.*

Thank you. A quick housekeeping note, Board Member Kane is on vacation and not with us tonight. The first item on the agenda is a continued public hearing for the Enclave at Hyde Park. As a reminder, the applicants are seeking to change a previously existing subdivision of 74 units into a smaller more tight and compact subdivision that will contain 25 two-family homes. May I get a motion to re-open the public hearing?

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING:

ENCLAVE AT HYDE PARK

Site Plan and Special Use Permit (#16-49)
Location: Cream Street at Long Branch Road
Grid #: 6263-01-465957 (1 of 79 grid #s available upon request)

MOTION: Mr. Murphey

SECOND: Mr. Oliver

To re-open the public hearing for site plan and special use permit for The Enclave at Hyde Park.

Absent	Ms. Kane
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Mr. Murphey
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Ms. Dexter
Aye	Mr. Dupree
Aye	Mr. Pickett

VOICE VOTE 6-0 Motion carried

Chairman Dupree: Mr. Alexander and Ms. Patti, welcome back. For those in the audience, this has been subject to numerous discussions, meetings...we believe we're nearing the end of it. In this instance, this requires not just a re-subdivision so new lot lines can be drawn, but under our Code, two family housing requires special use permits as well as site plan approval. So we've been working with the applicants pretty much throughout the year. This won't be relevant to those in the audience, but Mr. Alexander just dropped off a nice thick sheath of documents for Victoria to review. Ms. Polidoro has her work cut out. Just to explain this to the audience because these was a subdivision previously created that's over 50 units, 50 unit subdivisions and greater require central water and central sewer. Once the subdivision is made, there are actually water works corporations and sewer transportation corporations that are formed that actually own the land. To re-subdivide it and redraw the lines is legally complicated, even though we all believe this is a much better project in terms of where the market is right now than what the initial project was. On that note, let me turn it over to you guys.

[Type here]

Mr. Alexander: Thank you. We appreciate that beginning and Victoria, I know we need to set up an SDP site and coordinate with your office so you can download documents.

Ms. Polidoro: This is a good start.

Mr. Alexander: We think we got it right. I think candidly, there have been some minor changes in the drawings since we drew up all those documents on June 30th. The final subdivision set is from July 5th or 6th, so there are some refinements that have occurred, so I think that probably there are some things that you and I should talk about. Not only intellectually but when we get in the weeds as to, did we approach it right and also did we make some changes since then. Because there were discussions about how the condominiums were going to be formed with the tax assessor, so Nicole and I were talking about this right before the meeting...Lots 4 and 13's configurations have definitely changed and we are still not 100% sure and need to get with the condo attorney as to the exact...Lot 4 is where the access easement goes right through, so we're trying to confirm and I drew it up assuming that the parking spaces that we relocated to that area would be in the access easement. They may actually need to, for the reasons associated with the condo plan and the condo attorney, actually wind up being on Lot 4, so then the grantor of the easement would change. So that's exhibit D. We did an emergency access easement and we may need a second document or we may need to make Lot 4 clearly taking subject to that parking area occurring. So we have to figure out a couple of little things like that as we go forward. Definitely in the weeds on that. We also compared to the preliminary subdivision, this plan is not 100% accurate from what we submitted, particularly with regard to this parking area right here. We're also now looking at moving the water parcel, essentially this area up to here and we're looking at moving it to wrap around these lots up to here. Just to make it bigger because it's losing compared to the Meadows, if you can sort of recall the Meadows where a lot of this land in here was water works land. The justification is the overall area that the water works owns isn't really decreasing as far as land mass that much so it rationalizes it out. So lots of little things like that we're still refining, but the documents have been drawn up as per the plan that was approved at preliminary, but because of some of the changes, we leave it to the Board as to whether you want to have a public hearing on final. I mean you're going to have a public hearing for the special permits for the two family anyway. Under a belt and suspenders approach we would be comfortable with notice for that, so that way no one later says preliminary and final did have differences, were they appreciable we might as well have a public hearing anyway.

Chairman Dupree: Since we're in public hearing mode, aren't we still on the site plan and special use permit? *Ms. Polidoro confirmed this.* So set a separate but co-equal public hearing, so we would just have it on all three again. At the end of this discussion we can resolve that, but I think that sounds like a good idea to me. Is there anything else that you'd like to add, Ms. Patti?

Ms. Patti: No, I think Neil kind of addressed any of the outstanding issues that we have, a lot of the items that were conditions of preliminary approval we have worked to address in our revised plan set that we submitted. Obviously, there are a couple of

[Type here]

outstanding items that do need to be addressed, but the majority of those are the legal documentation that has to be reviewed between the attorneys.

Chairman Dupree: so before we move onto the consultants, we had an issue at our agenda meeting about the sidewalks. So sidewalks are proposed at 4 feet. Full ADA compliance is 5 feet. You're supposed to have 5 feet except where physical limitations of the land prevent that. That noted, 4 feet can be acceptable under ADA, however you have to have every 200 feet a 5 by 5 foot landing. The landing, it says straight out, can be carports or driveways. Someone would have to certify that they are no more than 200 feet apart and no more slope than 2% as I recall. So, it appears that if we want to keep this at 4 feet we could allow the driveways to be the landings, assuming that there's no space that would be further than 200 feet. I'm just bringing that up because that's for the Board to determine. This is one of those small pesky issues that we need to resolve so we can get this done and finalized. Mr. Setaro do you have any comments?

Mr. Setaro: Yes. Liz and I have had an opportunity to go through the latest set of plans. We have a draft memo and if we were starting this project as a blank canvas, it would be a much easier project, but being that we're mixing and matching some things here with the old project there is a lot of complexity. I talked to Ken Casamento today and sent an email around today with Michael and Victoria. What I would like to do is have a technical meeting similar to what we did with Mavis when we had the applicants come into our office and go over a lot of the small things that we found. I'm going to talk about a couple of the highlights. Things that I'd like for the Board to think about, but there seem to be a lot of minor things and instead of me writing a 30 item memo...I think if we just sit down and go through and I write a summary memo after we have the meeting, similar to what I did with Mavis, I think that will be a better way to handle it. Ken and I talked about that today. So let's go over a couple of things. The Chairman started talking about the sidewalks. So, we were looking at the plans and we've talked a lot here about the sidewalks and I looked through the DOT document on sidewalks. We're in a residential subdivision and if they are going to have sidewalks, you typically have sidewalks on both sides of the road and the premise is to limit crossings, people crossing from one side to the other. When Ken and I talked today, I understand the applicants point from cost. It's a low volume road, the speed of the vehicles shouldn't be too much, so I can understand the push back. What I said was, we have the caveat of the clubhouse and the clubhouse has a pool and some other things there. I think with that you may see more people walking here to the clubhouse instead of jumping in their car. So I think we should discuss the possibility of sidewalks on both sides of the road basically where you have the houses on both sides of the road. I think right now you have the sidewalk on the north side of the road.

Chairman Dupree: It would be on the south side opposite the first 5 houses, you would cross the road and then access the Bocce court,

Mr. Setaro: Again, I think that's something that as the Planning Board members have some comments that's something that we can talk about. A couple of other things as far as the buildings go, at some point we're going to have to get the elevations for the new units. They're going to have to specify the choice of colors with the manufacturers on them, the shingles specs, the siding specs and then Ken and I

[Type here]

talked a little bit about what's going to happen to the clubhouse. One of the houses that's out there now is going to be re-used, so what is going to happen to that. Are there going to be any exterior improvements to it? I believe you guys had a meeting with Don Westermeyer because there was a concern as to whether the building would meet the code for a clubhouse. I believe that it's okay, is that right?

Ms. Patti: I believe so. The architect, Mauri Associates is working directly with Don to make sure that everything is up to code.

Mr. Setaro: But I think that there was a question of if there's a problem with the building then we're just going to go knock it down and then we'll build new or something like that.

Ms. Patti: I think financially it made more sense that to try and rebuild everything from the inside out.

Mr. Setaro: Assuming that it's going to be there, then we should get some information on what if anything is going to be done to the exterior of it.

Ms. Patti: Yes, our forthcoming submission will have the elevations, the colors, the materials board, the layout for the membership club, all of the architectural...

Chairman Dupree: Mr. Tompkins from Mauri Associates came back in April to show us a brief sort of review of colors. Mrs. Moss would like to have the paint chips submitted, not the shingles, etc., but a story board for us to review again, so she can take a picture of it, I think.

Mr. Setaro: Yes, we should have that in the file for when they build. I talked to Ken about the subdivision plat. The houses are going to be on actual lots, then we've got several parcels that are HOA parcels, we have a water parcel, a sewer parcel, a solar parcel and a clubhouse parcel. We just need to get his surveyor together and I haven't had a chance to ask our surveyor, but I don't know if some of these other parcels should have an actual lot number. They are going to have tax grid numbers because all of the parcels are going to be taxed, but I don't know if they should have a lot number or just say parcel A, parcel B, parcel C. We'll work that out. Another thing the Board may want to talk about, we have had discussions about the phasing of the sidewalk and when it would go in. There was a bunch of notes placed on the map and it's a little hard to follow when the sidewalks will be going in so I'd like to sit down again and maybe as the Board members have comments maybe that's something that we can talk about. But it wasn't clear to me from the notes on the map as to when the sidewalks would be going in in different areas. Along those lines we also have to talk about the landscaping and phasing, assuming that there is going to be phasing for the trees on the street. The other thing I talked to Ken about and I think it's already been discussed between Neil and Victoria, but I had a question about the parcel that's going to be left to the north, which is supposedly going to be the solar parcel...I just had a concern about whether if it didn't become a solar farm parcel, does that have the ability to be subdivided with more density? From what I understood today, you guys have already had some conversations on that. That came up at the ZBA and from what I understand even if there was going to be residential units there, it would be pretty minimal. I don't want to speak for anybody.

[Type here]

Ms. Polidoro: The Zoning Board intentionally left some density on the lot so that it wouldn't just go off the tax rolls and be unbuildable.

Mr. Alexander: It came up, we did talk about it. There's a whereas clause that said the 25 acre lot would retain the potential for dwelling units if not used for commercial use, currently 10 units under the zoning law. So the theory was, even know the variances were granted to create this project, again relating to the fact that you're essentially winding up with 50 dwelling units where 74 were. If for some reason the solar project didn't work out and you wound up with that lot coming in for its own project at 2.5 acres per dwelling unit, maximum is 10, 10 plus 50 is 60, so that still significantly less than the 74 that could have been built under the filed map that exists. And they were essentially comfortable with that math in that they were getting, worst case scenario a 20% reduction instead of a 1/3 reduction.

Ms. Polidoro: but you'd need to subject the road and the open space requirement.

Mr. Alexander: All agreed and not the goal here. The goal is to do a community solar project, two megawatts.

Chairman Dupree: For the audience, this proposal was actually approved under our prior zoning code so the density that they were guaranteed originally, the 74 lots was allowed under that code. The current code allows for much less density in the outlying greenbelt district which is why when the applicants first came to us proposing a significantly smaller layout. These roads were already roughed out. Water was already brought to them, each lot, as was sewer because it's a central sewer system here. So instead of it sprawling out with houses all along here, it's now going to be a compact dense development. These are basically town houses. They are quite nice. As I understand it, the project sponsor; Mr. Mermelstein would like to be selling this next spring, which will be exciting. We haven't had a new development of houses in Hyde Park on the market in a while. New that is, we still have continuing ones. Thank you Pete. I want to point out that we had tentatively agreed that as soon as let's say that house or that house, as soon as there is one house, a sidewalk section would go in for all the other ones. As for landscaping, I assume that because you have landscaping proposed here along the sidewalk, that those trees would go in when the sidewalks put in (*along the Bocce ball court*), but otherwise you'd wait to landscape until each house is built because otherwise you destroy the landscaping that's there.

Ms. Patti: Correct.

Mr. Setaro: So the street trees out in front of the houses would be planted at the time that each house is built?

Chairman Dupree: Yeah because you're going to have contractor's equipment going back and forth in through each one.

Mr. Setaro: We're going to have a bond for some of this, so it's something we can probably hash around when we have our meeting or we can still discuss it. I wasn't going to bring up the Bocce courts but being you brought up the Bocce courts, I'm

[Type here]

wondering if they should be moved to the clubhouse area? They are kind of like hanging out in the middle of nowhere. I don't know is that an okay thing?

Chairman Dupree: I've never played, I don't know. Look to the Italian (*toward Ms. DiNapoli*).

Mr. Setaro: Oh it's great.

Ms. DiNapoli: I agreed, I think it would be better near the rec center so it's all part of an activity area.

Mr. Setaro: And the parking is there. I know it's a big comment and a big decision.

Mr. Alexander: Fair point. We'll take this under advisement and discuss it with our client.

Chairman Dupree: I assumed it was located there just because it's closer to the housing and not part of the overall clubhouse complex. Ms. Polidoro any comments?

Ms. Polidoro: We have a lot to look at it may be that we schedule to go over the map and some of these documents together. The only other item that is lingering I think is again having to do with sidewalks, asphalt versus concrete. I just want to remind the applicant that if these are proposed to be Town roads, you have to follow the Town specs unless you do get a waiver from the Highway Super and the Town specs call for concrete.

Mr. Setaro: I did talk to the Highway Superintendent and he said as long as the Town doesn't have to maintain them and I believe the HOA is going to maintain them, that he didn't have an issue with it, but again we can get something in writing from them.

Ms. Polidoro: I guess maintenance...once they become a Town road, maintenance of sidewalks in a Town can be complicated because Towns unlike villages do not generally have laws that require maintenance of sidewalks by the adjacent landowners. So I think that's something we have to continue talking about...how we're going to deal with maintenance, because once they're in the Town road right of way, it's a Town sidewalk. So unless there is a law saying that the neighbors are responsible, it could become the responsibility of the Town.

Chairman Dupree: In other words, the Town Board would need to pass a law.

Ms. Polidoro: Consider adopting a local law saying that sidewalks are...

Chairman Dupree: So for those in the audience who are interested, this district doesn't really call for sidewalks. It's the Green Belt, it's supposed to be very rural in characteristic. We don't have curbs on the streets or anything else, but because it's site plan, under our Code, site plan requires sidewalks and certain other infrastructure installations. Because this is a fairly dense subdivision we assume that people will be walking. Particularly to the clubhouse. There is also passive recreation,

[Type here]

trails that are going to be allowed to be developed somewhere in through here for people to walk through woods if they'd like to. What we were attempting to make sure that there's a safe way to convey pedestrians and that doesn't just mean adults, we're also talking about children, people in wheelchairs, seniors...how they could get back and forth to their destination to the clubhouse from say back here and a sidewalk seemed prudent, but it's creating other complications as you see in terms of maintenance. Nicole, have you talked to your owner about this? Do you know if this is something that the HOA would want to do? Legally I'm sure there is a mechanism to convey maintenance to the HOA. Mr. Alexander is looking perplexed as I say that.

Mr. Alexander: Are you talking about potentially having the sidewalk outside the Right of Way or would you have the sidewalk in the Right of Way? I'm just thinking out loud.

Ms. Polidoro: I'm not talking about moving the sidewalk, I'm just saying that if it's in the Right of Way that the Town could consider adopting the law that would require the adjacent landowners to maintain the sidewalks, thereby having the HOA maintain it. But without such a law, the sidewalk becomes the responsibility of the Town at which point the Town would probably want concrete instead of asphalt. To come full circle.

Chairman Dupree: Let's bring this up at the technical meeting as well. I believe councilman Ray is here, there he is. Mr. Ray, this isn't in your district but this is something to raise to the Town Board about whether or not there would be the appetite to pass a law that would create a responsibility for residential property owners to take care of any sidewalk in front of their homes instead of the Town, if it's in the Town Right of Way. Mr. Alexander, I can't believe we would want to put the sidewalk out of the Town Right of Way because then it gets really close to the houses and then you have set back issues, etc.

Mr. Alexander: That's where I was heading.

The Chairman appealed to the Board Members for comments on the sidewalks. Mr. Pickett was okay with them on one side of the road, phased with new construction. Ms. Dexter having recently attended a planning course in which they simulated handicap impairments, felt that asphalt once pitted was very difficult to wheel over and that a 4' width was too narrow to make turns. She favors a 5' width in concrete and suggested that one side of the road should be adequate. Mr. Oliver also indicated that one side of the road would suffice, but he also wanted the width to be consistent throughout. He reminded the applicants that the first stretch of sidewalks would require turnaround bump-outs if they were not 5' wide. Ms. DiNapoli had some concerns about street trees uprooting the sidewalks and definitely wanted them on both sides of the road in concrete.

Mr. Alexander suggested that the Board was over emphasizing the walkability function and not the whole streetscape. Claiming there would be 70 feet of street area (50' Right of Way, 5' of sidewalks on either side, grass and trees) which would dwarf the individual home areas. Mr. Setaro and Ms. Polidoro disagreed and indicated that it would be closer to 44' with sidewalks on both sides, all within the 50' Right of Way.

[Type here]

Chairman Dupree: I will weight and say that I'm fine with it being on one side and I think that maybe makes it definite. As for the concrete versus asphalt, I prefer concrete as well. I can give you the estimate of the costs, it runs anywhere from \$130/linear foot for a 5' sidewalk to \$300, an average of \$150/linear foot for 5' wide. In the DOT manual on this, they are envisioning a lot of cross traffic when they talk about both sides. That's more aimed at commercial uses where you're going to park here and then cross the street a lot, where you want to minimize street crossings. I think the applicants have made a very good case that here we know what the daily vehicle trips are and it's not high. This should be enough for us to move forward to the technical meeting. I don't have any other comments myself except for nice job with the last submission, we're really close. Would anyone from the public like to speak about this application? *There was no public comment.*

MOTION: Mr. Murphey

SECOND: Mr. Oliver

To adjourn the public hearing for site plan and special use permit for The Enclave at Hyde Park to August 16, 2017.

Absent	Ms. Kane
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Mr. Murphey
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Ms. Dexter
Aye	Mr. Dupree
Aye	Mr. Pickett

VOICE VOTE 6-0 Motion carried

MOTION: Mr. Murphey

SECOND: Ms. Dexter

To set a public hearing for approval subdivision-final plat for The Enclave at Hyde Park for August 16, 2017.

Absent	Ms. Kane
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Mr. Murphey
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Ms. Dexter
Aye	Mr. Dupree
Aye	Mr. Pickett

VOICE VOTE 6-0 Motion carried

[Type here]

NEW PUBLIC HEARING:

RIGHT HOMES RE-SUBDIVISION

3 lot Re-Subdivision-lot (#16-46)
Location: Reservoir Road, Staatsburg
Grid#: 6167-04-732397, 706377 and 714426

Chairman Dupree: The next item on the agenda a new public hearing for Right Homes Re-subdivision. As a reminder, this is a three lot subdivision that was previously approved. It's located on Reservoir Road in Staatsburg. I believe a number of residents are here to speak about this. Mr. Martin is representing the applicant. In this instance what is proposed is essentially a redrawing of lot lines so that an additional driveway can be created. In the prior approval there was a single driveway and an easement. The owner is here and realtors have suggested to him that it might be easier to sell the lots if there was a different access point rather than one single shared, so that's essentially what's come here. Let me turn it back over to you Mr. Martin. It's good to have you back.

MOTION: Ms. Dexter
SECOND: Mr. Oliver

To open the public hearing for Right Homes Re-Subdivision.

Absent	Ms. Kane
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Mr. Murphey
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Ms. Dexter
Aye	Mr. Dupree
Aye	Mr. Pickett

VOICE VOTE 6-0 Motion carried

Mr. Martin: Good evening, Ernie Martin from KC Engineering in Poughkeepsie representing Mr. Dziubelski, Right Homes.

Mr. Martin briefly reviewed the proposed changes from the original 2008 13.18 acre, 3 lot subdivision with one common driveway. Of note, the house and septic on lot 3 have been moved closer to the road and would have its own driveway. Lots 1 and 2 would share a new common drive which would require clearing to obtain the required sight distances. He also indicated that the open space conservation areas have been altered slightly.

Chairman Dupree: Just a reminder, I believe we sent a memo on this asking for some information that we still haven't heard back from. Ms. Polidoro, back in February requested a copy of the open space easement, which I don't think she's received yet, so we're still waiting on that. That noted, let me turn it over to the consultants, Mr. Setaro, any comments?

[Type here]

Mr. Setaro: Part of what you had mentioned, we are waiting for the drainage calculations. We had a concern about water coming down through where the common drive was. There's a natural flow of water to the adjacent Utter property, so Ernie was going to provide some basis storm drainage calculations.

Mr. Martin: That's true. Just to give you kind of a highlight. There is a Town drainage system that's located in there right now that discharges in a wetland area back here. It's the intent that some of this drainage would be directed, collected and discharged into that existing drainage system. In addition, there is drainage that runs in a westerly direction towards the Utter property. We had some concerns relative to the separation of the septic system and a little water quality area. We kind of worked that out with the Health Department. A combination of small detention pond and an overflow area here. The idea is to keep the post development equal to or less than.

Mr. Setaro: Again, you know that was on there, but we need some kind of calculations to back that up. Honestly, we don't want to increase the amount of water that's going into the Town drainage system because that discharges through our easement to the Wyant property across the street and I don't want to create any issues for those folks over there. It basically goes right through their yard. I think that was in our memo too. It's something to look at. The other thing is that there's obviously going to be residents here tonight. We've gotten a bunch of written comments. Folks have stopped into the Planning office about their concerns...valid concern. In order to get the sight distance on the common drive as you're looking left out of the common drive, there has to be quite a bit of clearing of the bank there. I went out there the other day and I do think most of that bank is going to be rock excavation. There are several large trees growing there. You usually don't see large trees growing in rock outcrops. You could see several areas of surface rock on that bank, so depending on where the neighbor's wells are, that's definitely a valid concern. Especially if the wells are shallow. Hammering rock and having an impact on their wells. I'm sure we're going to hear about that and we're going to have to look at. One of the ways, if we've had other concerns from neighbors about well or septic resulting from a subdivision next to them, we've written a letter to the County Health Department requesting that they make that a part of their review. The one with the single driveway has to go back to the DOH because you're moving the septic. That's one thing we could do, the other thing we certainly have the ability to hire professionals that have more experience than I do in terms of hydrogeology. I'm not sure we're going to get to that point, but let's hear what the neighbors have to say.

Chairman Dupree: Agreed. This Board did contract with Chazen companies, Russel Urban-Mead. He's considered one of the best hydrogeologists in the County. If you recall on a potential subdivision at the top of Molly's Way, because we had neighbors also worried about impacts to their wells. As it turns out, Mr. Urban-Mead was actually able to allay their fears. The drawdown in water was actually going to be below where we thought it was going to be and not affecting Molly's Way residents. At any rate, that is a considerable expense to undertake. I just want to remind the Board, it's a pretty narrow and special field. Thank you Pete. Ms. Polidoro, any comments?

Ms. Polidoro: The Board set the public hearing to start taking public comments, but at this point there is still not sufficient information to finish the SEQR review. We're

[Type here]

still waiting on drainage and blasting and there are still lots of impacts to be identified. The Board should consider whether the open space area has been appropriately sited where it's being blasted and where it's going to be denuded for the sight line easement. Whether that is appropriately called open space. And lastly, I'm hoping the applicant can provide some guidance. With the sight line easement, who are you proposing will be the grantee and how is it going to be maintained and how are you going to assure its maintenance? It becomes a safety issue.

Mr. Martin: Well the intent was to deed it to the Town, to be maintain by the Town.

Mr. Setaro: No, we don't want to do that. We don't want to maintain the sight easement for individuals. Usually it would be granted...the lot who receives the benefit from the increased sight line, usually that easement is granted from one lot to the next. I think this easement is crossing over lot lines. The one lot would grant the other lot to keep it cleared on their property. The Town doesn't want to have any responsibility for sight easements for private driveways. We do have some for roads.

Ms. Polidoro: The Town way want the right to go it but not the obligation. Just in case they ever need to clear it. When it comes down to being between two parties and one party stops maintaining it, you are going to have a safety issue. That's something to consider.

Chairman Dupree: The other issue that you brought up. The purpose of open space is to allow for passive recreation or movement of animals. The question you're raising is can you remove trees, essentially denude an area and still considerate to be open space. That's something for the Board to consider. I would normally go to the Board for comments but would you guys like to hear form the public before. *They answered affirmatively.* Anyone who wants to speak, just come up one at a time and be sure to state your name for the record.

Mr. Elliott: Brian Elliott, 80 Reservoir Road

Minutes in progress draft form...

MOTION: Mr. Murphey

SECOND: Ms. Dexter

To adjourn the public hearing for Right Homes Re-Subdivision to August 16, 2017.

Absent	Ms. Kane
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Mr. Murphey
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Ms. Dexter

[Type here]

Aye **Mr. Dupree**
Aye **Mr. Pickett**

VOICE VOTE **6-0** **Motion carried**

DOSIO-4 HIGH ST.

Site Plan Approval (#2017-24)
Location: 4 High Street, Staatsburg
Grid#: 6167-03-095418

MOTION: Mr. Murphey
SECOND: Ms. Dexter

To open the public hearing for Dosio-4 High Street.

Absent **Ms. Kane**
Aye **Mr. Oliver**
Aye **Mr. Murphey**
Aye **Ms. DiNapoli**
Aye **Ms. Dexter**
Aye **Mr. Dupree**
Aye **Mr. Pickett**

VOICE VOTE **6-0** **Motion carried**

MOTION: Mr. Murphey
SECOND: Ms. DiNapoli

To adjourn the public hearing for Dosio-4 High Street to August 2, 2017.

Absent **Ms. Kane**
Aye **Mr. Oliver**
Aye **Mr. Murphey**
Aye **Ms. DiNapoli**
Aye **Ms. Dexter**
Aye **Mr. Dupree**
Aye **Mr. Pickett**

VOICE VOTE **6-0** **Motion carried**

CIRE OF DUTCHESS

Extension of time to Commence and Complete Construction (#58-08)
Location: 4185 Albany Post Road
Grid#: 6064-02-941754

MOTION: Mr. Murphey
SECOND: Ms. Dexter

To open the public hearing for Cire of Dutchess.

[Type here]

Absent	Ms. Kane
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Mr. Murphey
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Ms. Dexter
Aye	Mr. Dupree
Aye	Mr. Pickett

VOICE VOTE 6-0 Motion carried

MOTION: Mr. Murphey
SECOND: Ms. Dexter

To adjourn the public hearing for Cire of Dutchess to August 2, 2017.

Absent	Ms. Kane
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Mr. Murphey
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Ms. Dexter
Aye	Mr. Dupree
Aye	Mr. Pickett

VOICE VOTE 6-0 Motion carried

WORKSHOP:

BELLEFIELD/ST. ANDREWS PROPERTY
Subdivision and Site Plan Approval-Hotel (#2017-4)
Location: Albany Post Road
Grid#: 6163-01-131849

This application is set for another workshop on August 16, 2017.

OTHER BUSINESS:

HINZ-SHAFFER, KATE
Site Plan Waiver-Accessory Structure (#2017-20)
Location: 7 Maple Lane
Grid#: 6064-02-578966

Kathleen Hinz-Shaffer

6064-02-578966

SITE PLAN WAIVER
Town Code Section 108-9.4 C 2

Date: July 19, 2017
Resolution #: 2017-20

Moved By: Mr. Murphey
Seconded By: Ms. Dexter

[Type here]

Whereas, an application requesting a waiver of site plan has been made to the Town of Hyde Park Planning Board by Kathleen Hinz-Shaffer, on May 5, 2017, for property located at 7 Maple Lane, Hyde Park, NY, and

Whereas, the application is to construct an accessory building associated with the single family home that is located in an historic overlay district, and

Whereas, the change will have minimal impact to the character of the neighborhood as affirmed by the Zoning Board of Appeals on July 12, 2017 and

Whereas, the Planning Board has reviewed the request submitted by the applicant, and has received a recommendation from the Zoning Administrator, and

Whereas, the applicant is required to return to the Planning Board for all other changes to the property, and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town of Hyde Park Planning Board hereby waives site plan requirements for the file entitled Hinz-Shaffer, regarding the specific request as received May 5, 2017 as amended by the Zoning Board of Appeals, July 12, 2017, and in the building permit application file for this project.

Absent	Mrs. Kane
Aye	Mr. Murphey
Aye	Ms. Dexter
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Mr. Pickett
Aye	Mr. Dupree
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli

Voice Vote 6-0 1-Absent Motion Carried

CRAIG THOMAS-ORKIN
Sign Permit Recommendation (#2017-30)
Location: 1186 Route 9G
Grid#: 6165-03-440388

**RESOLUTION RECOMMENDATION for ISSUANCE OF SIGN PERMIT
PURSUANT TO TOWN CODE SECTION 108-24.3 A (4) (d)**

**1186 Route 9G
Replacement Free Standing Sign
Parcel 6165-03-440388**

Date: July 19, 2017

Moved By: Mr. Pickett

Resolution: #2017-30

Seconded By: Mr. Murphey

[Type here]

WHEREAS, Jeffrey Herzlinger of Visual Concepts, Inc., been granted permission by the property owner, Craig Thomas of C.T. Pest Control LLC, to apply for signage associated with a Craig Thomas Pest Control and Orkin, and

WHEREAS, a complete submittal of an application for a replacement free standing sign has been made, and

WHEREAS, the sign has been designed to be code compliant; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, the Board hereby recommends the Zoning Administrator issue the sign permit for Craig Thomas Pest Control/Orkin, based on the drawing by Visual Concepts, Inc., as submitted with the Application form.

Aye	Mr. Dupree
Aye	Ms. Dexter
Aye	Mr. Pickett
Absent	Mrs. Kane
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Mr. Murphey
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli

Voice Vote 6-0 1-Absent Motion Carried

RODEWALD-CONSOLINI
Site Plan Waiver-Front Entry (#2017-31)
Location: 29 Howard Blvd
Grid#: 6065-04-880359

James Rodewald and Marella Consolini

6065-04-880359

SITE PLAN WAIVER
Town Code Section 108-9.4 C 2

Date: July 19, 2017
Resolution #: 2017-31

Moved By: Mr. Oliver
Seconded By: Ms. Dexter

Whereas, an application requesting a waiver of site plan has been made to the Town of Hyde Park Planning Board by James Rodewald and Marella Consolini, on July 10, 2017, for property located at 29 Howard Boulevard, Hyde Park, NY, and

Whereas, the application is to reconfigure the front entry to the single family home that is located in an historic overlay district, and

Whereas, the change will have minimal impact to the character of the neighborhood, and

[Type here]

Whereas, the Planning Board has reviewed the request submitted by the applicant, and has received a recommendation from the Zoning Administrator, and

Whereas, the applicant is required to return to the Planning Board for all other changes to the property, and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the **Town of Hyde Park Planning Board** hereby waives site plan requirements for the file entitled **Rodewald-Consolini**, regarding the specific request as received July 10, 2017, and in the building permit application file for this project.

Absent	Ms. Kane
Aye	Mr. Murphey
Aye	Ms. Dexter
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Mr. Pickett
Aye	Mr. Dupree
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli

Voice Vote 6-0 1-Absent Motion Carried

MOTION: Mr. Murphey

SECOND: Ms. Dexter

To approve the minutes of the June 7, 2017 Planning Board meeting.

Absent	Ms. Kane
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Mr. Murphey
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Ms. Dexter
Aye	Mr. Dupree
Aye	Mr. Pickett

VOICE VOTE: 6-0 Motion carried

MOTION: Mr. Murphey

SECOND: Ms. Dexter

To approve the minutes of the June 21, 2017 Planning Board meeting.

Absent	Ms. Kane
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Mr. Murphey
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Ms. Dexter
Aye	Mr. Dupree
Aye	Mr. Pickett

[Type here]

VOICE VOTE: 6-0 Motion carried

MOTION: Ms. Dexter

SECOND: Mr. Pickett

To adjourn.

Absent

Aye

Aye

Aye

Aye

Aye

Aye

Ms. Kane

Mr. Oliver

Mr. Murphey

Ms. DiNapoli

Ms. Dexter

Mr. Dupree

Mr. Pickett

VOICE VOTE: 6-0 Motion carried